

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
7

8 ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,

2:11-CV-1538 JCM (RJJ)

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,

12 Defendants.  
13

14 **ORDER**

15 Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty's second motion for  
16 immediate injunctive relief. (Doc. #48).

17 On April 17, 2012, this court entered an order denying plaintiff's first motion for immediate  
18 injunctive relief. (Doc. #41). The court found that the first motion did not clearly articulate the  
19 relief plaintiff sought because it simply referred to the "injunctive relief requested in the partial  
20 summary judgment motion . . . ." (Doc. #41). The court further found that plaintiff had failed to  
21 present the court with specific facts showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage  
22 would result before the adverse party could be heard. (Doc. #41).


23 The instant motion for immediate injunctive relief is similarly defective. Plaintiff still does  
24 not clearly articulate his requested relief, but rather refers the court to "page 15 of the amended  
25 complaint." (Doc. #48). Further, plaintiff has not provided the court with specific facts showing that  
26 immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse parties can be heard  
27 in opposition. FED. R. CIV. P. 65.  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that *pro se* plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty's second motion for immediate injunctive relief (doc. #48) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

DATED May 21, 2012.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE